

Appl. No. 10/774128

REMARKS

The following remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed on May 4, 2005. Upon entrance of the amendments set out above, claims 26-30, 32-38, 40, 42-46, 49-52, 55-61, 63, 65, 67-70, 72, 74-75 and 96-104 remain pending in this application.

Claim 104 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 25, 41, 48, 49, 54, 63, and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the UK patent application no. GB2258958A taken with any one of the Cardinale article the Alberkrack et al. article or the Dixon article. Claims 44-46, 56, 57, 65, and 98-102 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the UK patent application no. GB2258958A taken with any one of the Cardinale article, the Alberkrack et al. article, or the Dixon article, and further in view of the Japanese document no. 2-41778. Claims 103 and 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the UK patent application no. GB2258958A taken with any one of the Cardinale article, the Alberkrack et al. article, or the Dixon article taken with the Japanese document no. 2-41778, and further in view of the patent to Redfern (3,614,592). Response is hereby made to these rejections.

Claims 26-30, 42, 43, 50-52, 55, 64, 96, and 97 were objected to, but included allowable subject matter. Claims 32-38, 40, 58-61, 67-70, 72, 74, and 75 were allowed.

Generally, each claim has either been allowed, cancelled, rewritten to be allowable in accordance with the objections by the Examiner, or depends from an allowable claim.

Claim 104 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because, "the inductor" of lines 2-3 lacked antecedent basis. Claim 104 has been amended to provide

Appl. No. 10/774128

the antecedent basis, and to describe the inductor as being part of the cycloconverter. Thus, this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 25, 41, 48, 49, 54, 63, and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over UK patent application no. GB2258958A taken with any one of the Cardinale article, the Alberkrack et al. article, or the Dixon article.

Claims 25, 41, 48, 54 and 95 have been cancelled. Claim 49 has been amended to depend from claim 50 (which was objected to but is now rewritten in independent form), and is thus allowable. Claim 63 has been amended to include the subject matter of objected to claim 64, and is thus allowable. Accordingly, the 103 rejection of claims 25, 41, 48, 49, 54, 63, and 95 has been overcome.

Claims 44-46, 56, 57, 65, and 98-102 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the UK patent application no. GB2258958A taken with any one of the Cardinale article, the Alberkrack et al. article, or the Dixon article, and further in view of the Japanese document no. 2-41778.

Claim 44 has been amended to depend from claim 42 (which was objected to but is now rewritten in independent form), and is thus allowable, as are claims 45 and 46 which depend therefrom. Claim 56 has been amended to depend from claim 55 (which was objected to but is now rewritten in independent form), and is thus allowable, as is claim 57 which depend therefrom. Claim 65 depends from claim 63, which was objected to but is now rewritten in independent form, and is thus allowable. Claim 98 has been amended to depend from claim 96 (which was objected to but is now rewritten in independent form), and is thus allowable, as are claims 99-102, which depend therefrom. Accordingly, the 103 rejection of claims 44-46, 56, 57, 65 and 98-102 has been overcome.

Claims 103 and 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over UK patent application no. GB2258958A

Appl. No. 10/774128

taken with any one of the Cardinale article, the Alberkrack et al. article, or the Dixon article taken with the Japanese document no. 2-41778, and further in view of the patent to Redfern (3,614,592). Claim 103 has been amended to depend from claim 96 (which was objected to but is now rewritten in independent form), and is thus allowable, as is claim which depends therefrom. Accordingly, the 103 rejection of claims 103 and 104 has been overcome.

Claims 26-30, 42, 43, 50-52, 55, 64, 96, and 97 were objected to for depending from rejected claims, but would be given favorable consideration if recast in independent form to include all of the limitations of the parent claims. Claim 64 was cancelled, and the remainder have either been rewritten to be allowable, or depend from a claim rewritten to be allowable.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application should be allowed. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned below if it will aid in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted



George R. Corrigan, Reg. No. 34,803
Corrigan Law Office
5 Briarcliff Court
Appleton, WI 54915
(920) 954-1099

*DN*F:\WP51\DOCS\ITW\7188.64\7188.64response3.wpd Thursday, August 04, 2005 3:24PM